

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 14-15, 26-36 currently remain in the application. Claims 1-25 were rejected. Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 14-15 have been amended. Please cancel claims 9, 11, 13 and 16-25 without prejudice to further prosecution. Please add claims 26-36.

Priority

The specification has been amended to include the U.S. patent number of the parent application. Original amendment to specification for priority was specified in Application Transmittal.

In-person interview of July 23, 2004

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his time during the in-person interview of July 23, 2004. During the interview, claim amendments to possibly place the claims in condition for allowance were discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-16 and 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being unpatentable over Dabrowski (US patent 6, 253, 119). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims that are remaining describe limitations such as recited in claim 1 of a portable hand-held device comprising “a microprocessor designed or configured to i) receive a request for validating the voucher wherein the validation of the voucher is for allowing the indicia of credit amount stored on the voucher to be exchanged for cash when a game player presents the voucher to a non-game player utilizing the portable hand-held device in a game playing area and wherein the validation of the voucher is one of one or more types of game service transactions provided on the portable hand-held device; ii) send a game service transaction validation request for validation of the voucher from the portable hand-held device to a transaction server via wireless the communication interface wherein the game service transaction validation request comprises one or more data packets; iii) to receiving a game service transaction validation reply from the transaction server in the portable hand-held device via wireless communications wherein the game service transaction validation reply approves or rejects the validation of the voucher and iv) to generate the one or more game service interfaces on the display screen including a first game service interface for validating the voucher.” Dabrowski describes a non-portable script dispensing device 226 with a script dispensing device 230 integrated into a gaming machine. Dabrowski does not teach or suggest a portable hand-held device for validating a voucher storing

an indicia of credit amount wherein the validation of the voucher is for allowing the indicia of credit amount stored on the voucher to be exchanged for cash when a game player presents the voucher to a non-game player utilizing the portable hand-held device in a game playing area and wherein the validation of the voucher is one of one or more types of game service transactions provided on the portable hand-held device.” In Dabrowski, the device is non-portable. Further, in Dabrowski, the scrip is accepted, converted to “electronic” credits and stored in the device. The scrip is not validated and exchanged for cash, which would defeat the purpose of Dabrowski, which is to reduce the amount of coin-in and coin-out on the gaming machine. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that Dabrowski can’t be said to anticipate claims 1-2, 4-16 and 17-25 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Dabrowski (US patent 6, 253, 119) in view of Angell (6, 702, 672). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Angell teaches a wireless gaming device. Examiner relies on Angell to teach a removable memory. The combination of Dabrowski with the removable memory of Angell does not overcome the deficiencies of Dabrowski described above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Dabrowski and Angell can’t be said to render obvious claim 3 of the present invention and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Mary R. Olynick
Reg. No.: 42,963

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Ph. 510-843-6200